| 1 | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 9 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA | | |
| 110 111 112 113 114 115 | STEVEN ROBERT ANGELONIS, Plaintiff, v. CAROLYN W COLVIN, Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, Defendant. | CASE NO. 14-cv-05863 JRC ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES PURSUANT TO 42 U.S.C. § 406(b) | |
| 16 17 | | | |
| | This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), Fed. R. Civ. P. 73 and Local | | |
| 18 | Magistrate Judge Rule MJR 13 (see also Notice of Initial Assignment to a U.S. Magistrate Judge | | |
| 19 | and Consent Form, Dkt. 5; Consent to Proceed Before a United States Magistrate Judge, Dkt. 6). | | |
| 20 | This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Attorney's Fees Pursuant to | | |
| 21 | 42 U.S.C. § 406(b) (see Dkt. 27). | | |
| 22 | The Court may allow a reasonable fee for an attorney who represented a Social Security | | |
| 23 24 | Title II claimant before the Court and obtained a fa | avorable judgment, as long as such fee is not in | |

excess of 25 percent of the total of past-due benefits. See 42 U.S.C. § 406(b)(1); Grisbrecht v. Barnhart, 535 U.S. 789 (2002). When a contingency agreement applies, the Court will look first to such agreement and will conduct an independent review to assure the reasonableness of the fee requested, taking into consideration the character of the representation and results achieved. See Grisbrecht, supra, 535 U.S. at 807, 808 (footnote omitted) (citations omitted). Although the fee agreement is the primary means for determining the fee, the Court will adjust the fee downward if substandard representation was provided, if the attorney caused excessive delay, or if a windfall would result from the requested fee. See Crawford v. Astrue, 586 F.3d 1142, 1151 (9th Cir. 2009) (citing Grisbrecht, supra, 535 U.S. at 808). Here, the representation was standard, at least, and the results achieved excellent (see Dkt. 27, p. 1, fn. 1). See Grisbrecht, supra, 535 U.S. at 808. This Court remanded the case for further proceedings (Dkt. 23). Following a hearing, the Administrative Law Judge issued a fully favorable decision (see Dkt. 27, p. 2). There has not been excessive delay and no windfall will result from the requested fee. Plaintiff's total back payment was \$33,018 (see Dkt. 27, p. 2, fn. 1). Plaintiff has moved for a net attorney's fee of \$2,115.56 (see Motion, Dkt. 27, p. 1), and the Court has considered plaintiff's gross attorney's fee of \$8,245.50 (25% of back benefits) and the EAJA award received by plaintiff's attorney in the amount of \$6,138.94 (Dkt. 26). Parish v. Comm'r. Soc. Sec. Admin., 698 F.3d 1215, 1221 (9th Cir. 2012). Based on plaintiff's unopposed motion (see Dkt. 27), it is hereby ORDERED that attorney's fees in the amount of \$2,115.56, minus any applicable processing fee, be awarded to plaintiff's attorney pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 406(b). This amount should be released to plaintiff's

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| 1 | attorney, Rosemary B. Schurman, at 8123 NE 115 Way, Kirkland, WA 98034 or via automatic | | |
|----|---|-------------------------------|--|
| 2 | deposit. | | |
| 3 | Dated this 24th day of August, 2016. | | |
| 4 | _ | 1 Mard (waters | |
| 5 | | Richard Creatura | |
| 6 | T. | nited States Magistrate Judge | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |